



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

79

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| 10/700,814 | 11/04/2003 | Jeff Kline | 58674 (46910) | 6248 |
| 21874 | 7590 | 10/31/2006 | EXAMINER | |
| EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP P.O. BOX 55874 BOSTON, MA 02205 | | | | TAYLOR, NICHOLAS R |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2141 | |

DATE MAILED: 10/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/700,814 | KLINE ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Nicholas R. Taylor | 2141 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 August 2006.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 7-14, 16-21, 26 and 27 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 7-14, 16-21, 26 and 27 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 04 November 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Applicant's submission filed on August 14th, 2006, has been entered.

2. Claims 7-14, 16-21, 26, and 27 have been presented for examination and are rejected.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed August 14th, 2006, with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application

filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 7, 8, 10-14, 16-21, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Underwood et al. (U.S. Patent 6,697,825).

6. As per claim 7, Underwood teaches a method for administering a plurality of websites wherein at least one website is hosted at a server comprising the steps of: administering the said plurality of websites (Underwood, col. 6, lines 24-38) by accessing a respective website at an address corresponding to a hierachal level by a user; (Underwood, col. 12, lines 41-55; see welcome page of fig. 3; see also col. 13, lines 31-44)

determining the hierachal level rights of the user; and (Underwood, col. 12, lines 56-65; e.g. see fig. 4 & 5) providing an indicator to the user of the hierachal level at which they have accessed the website (Underwood, col. 12, lines 42-65; see also col. 8, lines 59-67).

7. As per claim 8, Underwood teaches the system further wherein said indicator is a graphical indicator (Underwood, col. 12, lines 42-65; see also col. 8, lines 59-67).

8. As per claim 10, Underwood teaches the system further comprising the steps of: storing the hierachal level of the user at the server; (Underwood, col. 12, lines 56-65; e.g. see fig. 4 & 5)

allowing the user to enter said website at a different hierachal level than that stored at the server; and providing a second indicator corresponding to the hierachal administrative level of the user corresponding to the level of which the user has accessed the website (Underwood, col. 8, lines 18-66; e.g., where an administrative user enters the site as a potential customer).

9. As per claims 11 and 26, Underwood teaches a method for administration of a plurality of websites, at least one of the plurality of websites being hosted at a remote server comprising the steps of:

administering said plurality of websites by (Underwood, col. 6, lines 24-38)
accessing the a respective website at an address corresponding to a hierachal administrative level; (Underwood, col. 12, lines 41-55; see welcome page of fig. 3; see also col. 13, lines 31-44)

obtaining login information from the user; (Underwood, fig. 3 and 46)
determining at the remote server the access rights of the user based upon access rights information stored at the remote server; (Underwood, col. 12, lines 56-65; e.g., see fig. 4 & 5)

aggregating the rights of the user; displaying enabling icons at the website corresponding to said aggregated access rights for said user; and (Underwood, col. 12, lines 56-65; e.g., see fig. 4 & 5; col. 29, lines 44-48)

providing a graphical indicator at the website of said hierachal administrative level at which access is made to the user (Underwood, col. 12, lines 42-65; see also col. 8, lines 59-67).

10. As per claims 12 and 27, Underwood teaches the system further comprising the step of grouping all users with common access rights into a plurality of respective groups and storing the groups at the server, determining to which group the user belongs, and enabling the access rights for the user based upon the rights granted to the group to which the user belongs (Underwood, col. 12, lines 56-65; e.g. see fig. 4 & 5; col. 29, lines 44-48).

11. As per claim 13, Underwood teaches the system further comprising the steps of determining a hierachal level of the user (Underwood, col. 12, lines 56-65; e.g. see fig. 4 & 5; col. 29, lines 44-48).

12. As per claim 14, Underwood teaches the system further wherein the indicator indicates the hierachal level corresponding to the address (Underwood, col. 12, lines 56-65; e.g. see fig. 4 & 5; col. 29, lines 44-48).

13. As per claim 16, Underwood teaches the system further comprising the steps of determining whether a user is authorized for access at the address corresponding to the predetermined access rights utilizing the access right information stored at the remote

server and, if authorized, aggregating the rights of the user (Underwood, col. 12, lines 56-65; e.g. see fig. 4 & 5; col. 29, lines 44-48).

14. As per claim 17, Underwood teaches the system further comprising the steps of:
grouping all users with common access rights in respective groups;
storing the respective groups at the server;
determining to which group the user belongs; and
aggregating the rights based upon the rights associated with the specific group to which the user is a member (Underwood, col. 12, lines 56-65; e.g. see fig. 4 & 5; col. 29, lines 44-48).

15. As per claim 18, Underwood teaches the system further comprising the step of accessing the website at a public address, determining whether any access rights for a user accessing the website at the public address have been stored, and displaying no icons at said website for said user when no access rights have been stored at the server for said user (Underwood, col. 12, lines 42-65; see also col. 8, lines 59-67; see login pages at fig. 3 and 46).

16. As per claim 19, Underwood teaches the system further wherein said icons enable editing of material on the website (Underwood, fig. 4).

17. As per claim 20, Underwood teaches the system further comprising the steps of:

determining a hierachal level of the user as a function of the rights of the user
(Underwood, col. 12, lines 56-65; e.g. see fig. 4 & 5; col. 29, lines 44-48).

18. As per claim 21, Underwood teaches the system further comprising the steps of:
storing the hierachal level of the user at the server; (Underwood, col. 12, lines
56-65; e.g. see fig. 4 & 5)

allowing the user to enter said website at a different hierachal level than that
stored at the server; and providing a second indicator corresponding to the hierachal
level of the user corresponding to the level of which the user has accessed the website
(Underwood, col. 8, lines 18-66, e.g., where an administrative user enters the site as a
potential customer).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

19. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all
obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

20. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Underwood et al. (U.S. Patent 6,697,825) and Swift (U.S. Patent 6,308,274).

21. As per claim 9, Underwood teaches the above, including different graphical indicators to represent hierachal levels (Underwood, col. 12, lines 42-65; see also col. 8, lines 59-67), yet fails to teach

wherein the graphical indicator is the color of a significant portion of the website as displayed to the user, said color corresponding to the hierachal administrative level of the user.

Swift teaches a method of restricting access based on hierachal levels (Swift, Summary) where color is used as a graphical indicator to display the access level to the user (Swift, column 13, lines 44-56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have combined Underwood and Swift to provide the color display of Swift in the system of Underwood, because doing so would make the current user rights obvious to help prevent accidental mistakes (Swift, column 1, lines 15-21).

Conclusion

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Taylor whose telephone number is (571) 272-3889. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00am to 5:30pm, with alternating Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3718.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nicholas Taylor
Examiner
Art Unit 2141



RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER